

From: [Janis Pargas](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Social Studies 5th grade standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 8:24:29 AM

To Whom it May Concern:

I do not understand these changes and why anyone would think that by using these new standards students will be better ready for college.

To start, they are not cohesive. Social studies is a story that should be taught in chunks and built on over time. According to the standards, a 5th grader is to compare the Declaration and the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution to events in the past and current events. The Revolutionary War is to be taught in 4th grade, so this is a non-sequitur lesson for 5th grade and teachers must try to build on prior knowledge probably forgotten. Then concerning the years 1800-2000, 5th graders are to tell events of importance such as Dred Scott, Native disputes, migration and immigration, influential people and westward expansion. What? None of this goes together, but it is just under a 200 year historical umbrella of time. Also, the Great Depression, WWI and WWII are to be covered, but only the "political, economic and social causes and consequences" of each. Oh and then, national symbols is thrown in there which could be more appropriate for younger students.

I am disappointed. I do not feel that educators are being listened to. By making these changes, the entire 4th grade curriculum is moved to 3rd grade. Second grade acquires third grade and so forth. Does the state realize how much money its schools will spend buying new materials? For instance, under these new standards, third graders now must learn Lewis and Clark. Being that it was previously a 4th grade standard, we now need all new textbooks, easy readers, and activities that are written for a lower reading level. Most certainly each classroom will want a new set of textbooks, for the one I currently have covers the new 4th grade standards. This is an entire curriculum "revolution" and it will be extremely expensive to make these vast changes.

I guess my big question is what "political, economic and social causes and consequences" are behind changing these standards? They are developmentally inappropriate at all levels. They are non-cohesive and do not build over time. They take the ideas of history that should be learned and not forgotten so that our next generations do not repeat the mistakes of the past but use them as guidelines, and turn them into a study guide for standardized testing.

--

Janis Pargas
5th Grade
Avenue City School

Confidentiality Notice: This electronic communication is from the Avenue City School District (ACES) and is only intended for its addressees. This communication may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise protected from disclosure by law and/or ACES policy. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agency responsible for delivering this information to its recipient, do not copy, circulate, forward or otherwise disclose this document. If you have received this

message in error, please notify the sender immediately by return email.

From: [Andrea See](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: 4th grade Social Studies standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 8:57:58 AM

First off let me say that I appreciate all of the hard work being put into creating these new standards. I would like to express my concern however on moving Missouri History to third grade. It worries me because some of the material will be too difficult for most third graders to comprehend. This will also come as a big expense to districts as they will have to purchase new texts for these grades- the 4th grade books will be too difficult for third graders. Also this will leave a group of students completely missing out on Missouri history and possibly a trip to our state capitol.

Thank you!

--

[Andrea See](#)
[Fourth Grade Teacher](#)
[Hermann Middle School](#)

From: [Allen, Elizabeth](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Jennifer.Waters](#); [Franklin, Melia](#)
Subject: K-5 Proposed Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 9:57:26 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

I am deeply disappointed by the proposed standards that have now been posted. I see no changes made in response to the comments made by elementary teachers. There continues to be no vertical alignment to the 6-12 ELA standards, which is a huge concern for students and teachers.

Our district has spent countless hours writing and aligning our curriculum to the current Missouri Learning Standards. Teachers have spent countless hours deconstructing these standards and working to ensure our students have the best possible literacy instruction. The level of thinking that the current standards demand is high and teachers have risen to this challenge for our students. It is frustrating to think that our state legislature has not responded to the teachers that have been charged by the state of Missouri to teach these students. It is even more frustrating to think that our teachers will now be given the standards in the shape they are in (no revisions) and have to revise all the work they have done for the past three years.

In addition to the time districts have spent aligning to the current standards, other districts including us have purchased materials that meet the current standards and are coded to the current standards. With a new set of standards that do not mirror the coding teachers see in manuals and assessments there will be a lot of confusion and frustration for all teachers.

Thank you for your time,
Beth

--

Elizabeth C. Allen
[Elementary ELA Curriculum Coordinator](#)
Fort Zumwalt School District
Professional Development Curriculum Center
9288 Mexico Road, O'Fallon, MO 63366
Phone: 636-474-8351
Fax: 636-980-1263

I am currently reading:

Every Child A Super Reader, Pam Allyn & Ernest Morrell
Total Participation Techniques, Persida Himmele & William Himmele

NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS: Any information contained in or attached to this message is intended solely for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient of this transmittal, you are hereby notified that you received this transmittal in error, and we request that you please delete and destroy all copies and attachments in your possession, notify the sender that you have received this

communication in error, and note that any review or dissemination of, or the taking of any action in reliance on, this communication is expressly prohibited.

From: [Patricia Creek](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Cc: [Sarah.Riss](#); [John Simpson](#)
Subject: Comments on draft of Missouri Learning Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 10:08:32 AM

Dear Margie,

I am a Math Interventionist at Avery Elementary in the Webster Groves School District (St. Louis). Even though I concentrate when pulling students on KDG, 1st, 2nd grade, I push into classes and work with KDG - 5th grade.

Wow..Bravo to the committee. What an improvement, the committee should be commended for what they have accomplished! Being a Math Interventionist I concentrated on the proposed Missouri Learning Standards in Math. I found it easy to read and follow the progression from KDG to 5th grade. I especially liked how it now spirals and connects to each grade over repetitive. Each category is so attainable for each grade; thus setting success up for the next grade up. The language is straight forward and teacher (even parent/student) friendly.

Thank you for your time and commitment to making the Missouri Learning Standards (Math K-5) much easier to follow and understand for everyone.

Patricia K. Creek
KDG, 1st & 2nd Math Interventionist
X 15203
(314) 963-6425 main office

From: [Lindsey Calvert](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 10:52:03 AM

I am writing because it makes no sense to me the reasoning for not following CCSS. The proposed learning standards are the exact same but not written nearly as well or clear. CCSS are easy to read and make a lot more sense. I also think that the 6th grade standards are way too difficult for that grade level. Some of the skills expected of the 6th graders are practically impossible. I teach 4th, 5th and 6th grade math and feel that most of the other standards are pretty accurate but 6th grade standards are too rigorous for them. I feel that we should adopt CCSS instead of writing out own that is not written as clearly.

--

Mrs. Lindsey Calvert
5th Grade Teacher
Macon Co. R-IV
New Cambria, MO



From: [Maranda Anderson](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Social Studies Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:10:41 AM

Commissioner Vandeven and team,

I want to thank you for allowing Missouri educators to have a voice in the new standards. The time and dedication you have put into making sure the standards are right for Missouri students is to be commended.

As you work to finalize the standards and make sure the vertical alignment is appropriate, I would like you to take into consideration leaving Missouri history in 4th grade. With the financial strains many districts are facing at this time, purchasing a new grade appropriate curriculum will be challenging for many. Not only am I concerned about the financial impact of moving these standards, but I am also concerned about 3rd grade students not being fully ready to comprehend the discussions of Missouri history at a depth of knowledge that would make the most impact. It is extremely important for students to be at a level where they are ready to gain the most out of learning about our great state.

Thanks for your consideration!
Maranda Anderson

--

[Maranda Anderson](#) | *Curriculum and Assessments Director*
Gasconade County R-I Schools | 573.486.2116 ext. 1306

From: [Breanna Figg](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Science 6-8 proposed standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:24:49 AM

I am opposed to the way that the standards are written. The expectation is too vague. We currently have standards divided by grade level and very specific as to how in depth we should teach the content. If we leave this up to each district to decide, students who move between districts while have varying gaps in their knowledge because not all districts will choose to teach the content in the same grade level.

The 6th and 8th grade GLE's currently spiral building upon the previous year's content with emphasis on life and earth science, and 7th grade focusing on physical science. Students struggle with learning the physical science at this grade level because their brains have not developed enough to understand abstract concepts that are not tangible, which is the current emphasis of the standardized testing. The content should be divided based on type of science (ie physical, earth, life) for each grade level so that a focus and in depth learning can take place.

It is unfair to ask students who have not had science education in elementary schools, due to the focus on language arts and math, to step into such topics in the 6th grade of which they have no foundation to build upon.

Testing of the standards should be considered – the test should not span across three grade levels. The content should be arranged by types of science (ie physical, earth, life) and assessed in that manner as opposed to expecting our students to know all areas of science. We teach and test each area of science separately in high school and college, why would we not follow that model in younger grades as well.

From: [Tina Wnuk](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Life Science-High School Concern
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:26:50 AM

While I think the standards on ecology, biodiversity, and conservation are excellent and much needed; I am concerned about the lack of emphasis on the cell. We are still placing emphasis on DNA and heredity, mitosis, and differentiation but not as much on how the cell and it's parts interact to make all of this and life possible. I see this is to be introduced in middle school, but my concern is that if it isn't reexamined and my students have to base what we're learning off of their recollection of an introduced topic at the middle school level they won't understand the concepts at the high school level unless I backtrack and we reexamine those concepts. Which I will whether or not it is placed in this listing of concepts to be covered because they will need the reminder.

My other concern is this; in my school there is a dual credit biology and a dual credit anatomy course taught. The students currently in those courses have a very good understanding of the cell from their time in biology 1. The expectation is that they will already have that base knowledge when entering that course or any college level course in biology. If the last time that information was learned was middle school; how can we expect to have prepared them for college level courses in biology?

Thank you,

Tina Wnuk
Biology Teacher
FTA Sponsor
STRIVE Site Director
Owensville High School
(573) 437-2174
!!Go Dutchmen!!



From: [Bechtel, William](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed standards for K-12 Science
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:41:54 AM

I am a middle school teacher and have been teaching since 1995.

Here are some of my concerns about the new standards...

1. In the beginning of the document it says that there is a scope and sequence for science grades K-12, however in the body of the document, the S&S only covers grades K-5.
2. Inquiry should be added as a GLE. While implied in other concepts, some formal instruction (however minimal) needs to take place.
3. I feel that the 6th-8th grade Concepts/GLEs need to be broken down into specific grade levels. We have a LOT of students moving from district to district that miss entire sections of the curricula. While this would not ensure that they are introduced to the material, it would at least GREATLY increase the chance.
4. Will the new state assessments reflect the change to a more hands-on approach, or will it remain mostly multiple choice? These need to be fairly consistent approaches, to reduce confusion among students and hopefully increase test scores.
5. Consider adding subgroups to the concepts to help with breaking items into units for teachers.

I like the change to more “hands-on” standards. This is what science should be. However there are still some glaring problems (grade-level content, state-assessment techniques versus presentation of concepts) that have not been thoroughly addressed for the past 20 years with the MAP, GLE’s, and current assessments. We need MORE guidance as to how and when concepts are being taught. Too many students are missing huge amounts of information because of inconsistencies between district curricula and state guidelines. You do not have to micro-manage, but at least help us reach ALL of the children in our state with the material.

William Bechtel
7th Grade Science Teacher
Morgan County R-2 Middle School (Versailles)
Work Phone – 573.378.5432

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are the property of Morgan County R-II School District, Versailles, Missouri, are confidential, and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom this e-mail is addressed. If you are not one of the named recipient(s) or otherwise have reason to believe that you have received this message in error,

please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message immediately from your computer. Any other use, retention, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited.

From: [Joye Carter](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Comments about the proposed standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 11:43:33 AM

First, let me explain that I began teaching in Missouri Public Schools 29 years ago. I teach Language Arts for 6-8 graders in Strain-Japan School District. Yesterday, Liz Condray, from our RPDC was visiting with our staff and we discussed the standards that have been created. As I understand, you are wanting feedback on the standards. I think the majority of the standards are so obscure teachers are not receiving any specific guidance on what is to be taught. An example of this is R1A. Each grade level from sixth grade to seniors all start with the same phrase, "Draw conclusions, infer and analyze". There is very little distinction between what needs to be taught in the sixth grade and what needs to be taught in the upper-level courses. I truly wish the State of Missouri Education people who are in positions to change our educational system would give our teachers legitimate curriculum. I have spent countless hours in Missouri Public Schools writing curriculum. Why don't you hire a staff to write one curriculum for each discipline that contains resources and guides? I'm not saying to have control over every teacher. Each teacher brings their own style to the classroom. I'm saying give the teachers a "recipe" and let them tweak it. These standards are so ambiguous that it really has no educational value.

--

Joye Carter

If kids come to us from strong, healthy functioning families, it makes our job easier. If they do not come to us from strong, healthy, functioning families, it makes our job more important.
-Barbara Colorose

From: [Ashleigh Noland](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards ELA 6-12 Feedback
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 12:24:28 PM

Good afternoon,

I feel that the updated proposed standards are a great improvement compared to the original proposed standards that came out a couple of months ago.

However, I am concerned with the fact that there are **no Language standards for ELA in grades 6-12**. I am an instructional coach for a junior high and work specifically with English Language Arts teachers. We continually talk about what grammatical/language rules students at our level should know. I see that grades K-5 have pretty specific language standards. I wish that this could continue on into grades 6-12.

Thank you for your consideration.



Ashleigh Noland
Instructional Coach &
Instructional Technology Specialist
Smith-Cotton Jr. High
660-829-6385

My new email address will be nolanda@sedalia200.org beginning July, 1 2016.

From: [Christina Chandler](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 12:24:15 PM

In reference to the 4th grade writing standards, I believe that a fourth grader is not developmentally ready to write multiple paragraphs over one topic. I believe the focus should be on perfecting the one paragraph response with a small introduction to multiple paragraphs.

Thank you,
Christina Chandler

From: [Heather S](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: New Missouri Standards Feedback
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 12:55:12 PM

I think the new standards look pretty good for English. My only concern was that R2A was not specific enough. It says that the chapter, sentence, etc. contributes to the meaning. The meaning of what? The overall text? The theme?

--

Heather Schoeneberg

6th grade English and Reading
California Middle School
211 S. Owen
California, MO 65018
573-796-2146

From: [Tracey Hankins](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: MLS Input on 3rd grade Social Studies
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 2:40:27 PM

Please accept my concern regarding the implementation of Missouri History standards at the third (3rd) grade level in the Proposed Missouri Learning Standards.

As a former third grade and fourth grade teacher, elementary principal, and superintendent with 28 years experience, I have extensive concerns that students at the age of 8 years old are not ready to comprehend the material presented in these proposed standards at third grade.

When teaching the content in fourth grade, the educators must give students specific examples and many experiences that allow them to make connections in order for students to comprehend and understand the content.

Please consider moving the Missouri History standards back to fourth (4th) grade for the benefit of our students.

Your partner in education,
Tracey Hankins

--

Dr. Tracey Hankins, Superintendent
Gasconade Co. R-I School District
573-486-2116
"Home of the Bearcats"

From: [Horn, Donna](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Regarding new standards in Social Studies
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 2:54:18 PM

I would like to comment about the proposed Social Studies standards. I have a concern about moving Missouri History to 3rd grade from its current place as a 4th grade standard. Teachers in my district have traditionally used the textbook - Missouri Then & Now. This textbook has a 2001 copyright date and to the best of my knowledge has not had a re-issue since that time. This text is difficult for 4th graders. While the information is excellent, the format is much more upper elementary. The reading level would be too difficult for the average 3rd grader to access. When I search online, all the textbooks from various companies for teaching Missouri History/government are noted as 4th grade level. There is nothing that I've found that is written on a 3rd grade level. My question is - what resources do the state leaders propose that 3rd grade teachers across the state use to teach Missouri History/government?

Moving the standards without thought to what resources are available and accessible to the student is foolhardy.

--

Donna Horn
4th Grade
Parkside Elementary
Desloge, MO 63601
dhorn@ncsd.k12.mo.us

From: [Kendra Brune](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: 3rd Grade Mo History Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 3:18:34 PM

Please accept my concern regarding the implementation of Missouri History standards at the third (3rd) grade level in the Proposed Missouri Learning Standards.

As an elementary principal who is responsible for the standards implementation, I have extensive concerns that students at the age of 8 years old are not ready to comprehend the material presented in these proposed standards at third grade. When teaching the content in fourth grade, the educators must give students specific examples and many experiences that allow them to make connections in order for students to comprehend and understand the content.

Please consider moving the Missouri History standards back to fourth (4th) grade for the benefit of our students.

Your partner in education,

Tracey Hankins



Kendra M. Brune

Principal

Hermann Elementary School

kbrune@hermann.k12.mo.us

(573) 486-3197 ext. 2400

"When you know your why, you can survive any how." V. Frankl

From: [Ronald Ludwig](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: proposed standards feedback
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 3:31:04 PM

If the EOC truly reflects the proposed standards, then Geographic Study Theme 1B and 1C are too vague. What are the key cities and resources of the original thirteen colonies?

Thanks,

LHS SS

From: [Doug Winkler](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: American History Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 3:34:07 PM

- Too many standards to actually teach in a 9 month period at the DOK levels
- If districts choose which to teach because of size then state is promoting inconsistency among schools
- Why can't DESE create a curriculum that is simple and states what are the most important items and skills to be taught. Teachers are overwhelmed by these curriculums ignore them.

Doug Winkler

Liberty High School

Social Studies Department Chair

816-736-6800 ext. 2615

dwinkler@liberty.k12.mo.us

From: [Stacey Craigmyle](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Missouri History
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 4:37:24 PM

In my opinion, this needs to be moved back to fourth grade. What is the reasoning for just all of a sudden switching an area of study like this? If you think about the teachers who have spent time and money collecting and creating materials, assessments, activities, and field trips, it just doesn't make sense. Unfortunately, many children don't remember a lot of what they learn in fourth grade, so they would remember even less from third. I think it's important for everyone to know facts and interesting information about the state in which they live. Please reconsider this decision!

Thank you,
Stacey Craigmyle

--

Stacey Craigmyle
Title 1
North Shelby Elementary

The time to be happy is NOW!

From: [Lora Hillman](#)
To: [1490Comments](#); [Palmyra R-I - Eric Churchwell](#)
Cc: [Larry Seago](#)
Subject: Feedback for ELA Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 4:58:13 PM

The format for the ELA standards are not consistent K-12. In order to have any vertical alignment to occur district-wide the following needs to occur:

1. The overall format needs to be the same. The K-6 standards look like the old GLE's with specific vocabulary and very specific standards. The 7-12 standards look just like the Missouri Learning Standards we had last year. Make a decision on one format and following that K-12.
2. Do they align? I don't know because of the different format between the two. Once the format looks the same K-12, I would hope that there would be strong spiraling of curriculum K-12.
3. I personally liked how the GLE's specified clearly the learning objectives. This allowed for clear state and local assessment expectations and learning targets.

Lora Hillman, Principal
Palmyra Elementary School
500 Ashland, Street
Palmyra, Missouri 634161
(573) 769-3736

EVERY PANTHER LEARNING EVERY DAY!

From: [Melissa Yount-Ott](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Proposed standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 5:03:13 PM

As a curriculum director, I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed Missouri Learning Standards. I have reviewed the standards posted at the Feb. 2016 link. Here is a summary of my concerns.

Overall

- We would MUCH prefer to keep the current Missouri Learning Standards to the new proposed standards. Over the last three years we have built a system around the current standards that is working, teachers have just grasped understanding of the current standards, and our student achievement data on both local and state measures shows positive trends in recent years.
- Further, my careful review of all K-5 standards does NOT reveal any improvement in standards for our schools, teachers or students. In fact, I would argue that especially in ELA, science and social studies, the standards don't have a smooth flow from K-5 to 6-12. We operate in a K-12 educational system where the ultimate goal is having students prepared for college, career & life. The focus at K-5 SHOULD BE alignment and preparation for 6-12! I would also add the challenge that elementary educators face in delivering all core content to students. The increase in volume of standards in the proposed standards compared to current MLS will really only result in a loss for our students. More volume does NOT mean more learning. It means that either more rote memorization will be encouraged or standards will be randomly left out due to lack of time. Depth of understanding and higher level thinking will not be a focus for our K-5 students because there simply won't be time! This will ultimately result in less mastery and preparedness for 6-12.

Specifically ELA

- The 6-12 standards have a nice organization and flow to them. I am VERY disappointed with the K-5 standards.
- I find the way the alignment of the K-5 standards to 6-12 standards in the left margin CRAZY. If I struggle to follow them and flip between documents, and I'm a curriculum director who works with standards all day, every day, then there is no way a classroom teacher will be able to view this relationship meaningfully. It is SO IMPORTANT for K-5 teachers to understand the end goal of where students are going in 6-12 but these standards will make that impossible. So sad!
- First the organization of strands makes less sense than in 6-12. Also, it is very unfortunate to see the volume of reading standards compared with the current MLS. It is really too much! A broader focus on reading processes that students need would be more beneficial, especially for comprehension. Districts would still have to ensure that students achieve these, but the minute details of every process and strategy would not be spelled out in such volume. This proposed version will be treated as a checklist to teach rather than meaningful learning expectations.
 - The strand of Making Connections is an example of this. Rather than expecting and assessing types of connections, we should be more focused on students using background knowledge to comprehend -- really, who cares if they know if it's text-text or text-self as long as they know how to bring what they know as a reader to a text and when they need more knowledge to better understand a text.
- Vocabulary is included under reading but this really should be a part of language. Vocabulary is more than just reading -- students should be learning and using vocabulary throughout all curriculum (literacy and disciplinary content) with reading and writing across the curriculum. It crosses literacy and is a larger

language structure that we use to understand reading. It is not a reading process along. Vocabulary should not be contained where it is.

- Poetry should be included within other literature standards and not a stand alone strand. We don't want a strand for every genre -- folktales, fables, science fiction, etc. Poetry is the same.
- In Reading Foundations, PLEASE change the label Phonemic Awareness to PHONOLOGICAL AWARENESS! The standards listed for students in K-1 include hearing word parts beyond individual phonemes - which is phonological awareness (a larger umbrella which phonemic awareness falls within). We work VERY hard to help our PreK-1 teachers understand the difference. I would hate to see our standards adding to this confusion for educators. (Plus it doesn't represent our understanding of these critical early literacy concepts well.)
- I don't see how printing & legibility is part of Grammar -- this seems misplaced or mislabeled.

Math

- We are not pleased to see the added volume of standards in data/statistics in K-5. It will take away from the focus on number sense and algebraic thinking in K-5 which is critical for student to use in data and statistics in 6-12.

Science

- I am disappointed at how the "topics" within the science strands are spread across multiple grade levels. For example, force and motion concepts should be grouped into 2-3 grades across K-5 -- there are way too many topics that spread across all or most grade levels. It is impossible for elementary classrooms to teach every topic in every strand of science well. It is more beneficial to group concepts/topics for depth so that real learning occurs.

Social Studies

- Like ELA -- I'm disappointed that K-5 aligns so poorly with 6-12. I also think these are very much about covering content and not about meaningful thinking or developing civic responsibility.
- I'm also very disappointed with the change in formatting from the original draft from the workgroup. I thought the K-5 draft standards from the workgroup were NOT good in content, but at I did think the attempt to group topics and focus on compelling questions at least was a move toward meaningful instruction. It's sad to see that is now lost too.
- I don't really know how to specifically comment on these -- I commented on the original draft in Oct. in detail and I don't see any improvements here. I really don't feel that our current MLS in social studies are good or current or relevant. However, I don't feel these proposed standards are any better for K-5.
- I do see some promise in the 6-12 standards. Unfortunately, this leaves us as a district with the dilemma of how do we prepare our students for 6-12 when the K-5 standards won't.

In summary, my preference for our students would be to keep the current MLS. However, if these proposed standards were adopted, my greatest concern is K-5 ELA.

Sincerely,

Melissa Yount-Ott
Director of Elementary Education
Pattonville School District
11097 St. Charles Rock Road
St. Ann, MO 63074
314-213-8009
Internal: 1018
myount-ott@psdr3.org



PATTONVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE AND

DISCLAIMER: This email and any attachments may be confidential and may contain privileged or copyright information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient(s), please call (314) 213-8050 and reply to sender to inform us that you have received this message in error and destroy all copies of the original message. Please do not copy, distribute or use this email or the information contained in it for any purpose without permission of the sender. Computer viruses can be transmitted via email. The district has taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this email; however, we cannot accept responsibility for any loss or damage arising from the use of this email or attachments.

From: [Trish Alexander](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 5:05:47 PM

In reviewing the Social Studies standards, it is very concerning to me that standards are being pushed down a grade level.

I currently teach 4th grade and have for 18 years. Missouri history has been the primary focus. This topic is for fourth graders has been challenging, but most importantly, it doesn't flow. The content is difficult enough for 9 and 10 year olds. I cannot imagine how 7-8 year olds will grasp this material. Students are struggling to read and understand where they are on a map, let alone understand state history in 4th grade.

I am very concerned that these new standards are far to inappropriate for the ages intended.

Trish Alexander
Valley Park Elementary
4th Grade Teacher
talexander@vp.k12.mo.us
<http://mrsalex.com>

From: [Declan FitzPatrick](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: these standards are not an improvement, please reject them
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 6:21:13 PM

Here's what I think in short:

These standards are not intentionally or coherently organized in a way that will provide vertical alignment.

These standards are not designed from any research base or instructional models.

These standards were not built from a frame-work or with a common set of goals.

Attempting to align our curriculum to them will not help our students to achieve College and Career Readiness benchmarks.

We will be better served by aligning our curriculum to nationally normed or criterion referenced assessments that build coherently to toward CCR standards.

By adopting these standards and building an assessment system around them, and holding school districts accountable for CCR achievement, DESE will create a split set of goals, because preparing for one will not result in preparing for the other.

Since actual College and Career Readiness is a goal more significant to students and parents. Districts will choose to focus on that rather than state accountability tests.

I would like to send this feedback to the comments email.

Here what I think, at length:

In ELA and Social Studies there is a significant failure of alignment. Some one has worked valiantly between the Oct. drafts and now to improve on this but since there are no College and Career Anchor standards to align K-12 there are huge differences in what is important, how skills and content are categorized, and what get emphasized.

For example the K-5 Standards look very much like the old GLEs. They emphasize that comprehension is something that results from analyzing and evaluating text and never present expectations that students should respond to texts for different reasons. The 6-12 ELA standards look more like the CCSS. They put comprehension expectations into context so they identify strategies that students need when reading for literary purposes, reading for the sake of writing, and reading for research.

The lack of alignment between the two will put strain on efforts toward vertical alignment within school districts.

Social studies is very confusing. There is no description or expectations for literacy within the content area at all. The K-5 standards avoid using the words read and write. They use examine and present instead.

There is no alignment between how the curriculum documents are laid out. The ways to group categorize the standards don't match.

The K-5 document proposes radically changing the grade level at which content is covered without any consideration of whether there are appropriate texts available at each level. For years students have been studying Missouri at 4th grade, and US History at 5th. The new standards put Missouri at 3rd, US History up to 1800 at 4th, and US History from 1800 to the present at 5th. While I admire the commitment to adding meaningful content to elementary, there has to be a way to talk about what will get the most learning for the most students without just shifting topics to lower and lower age groups.

The 6-12 Social Studies document specifically avoids telling people what grade level courses should be offered in. It begins with an organization that suggests there are going to be strands but then just turns into a chronologic list of tasks tied to chronological events.

Science and Math are more vertically aligned but there is still no guidance as to how to achieve with all of these standards within each grade level. How many standards can students be expected to master in one grade level. There is no guidance here.

None of the four subject areas presents a recommended or even possible scope and sequence of units. The only way to accomplish all that is in the documents is to choose a sequence of units and then make spread the standards across them in the way that makes the most sense. The documents themselves provide no logic to help a person do this.

--



I've switched to gmail!

fitzpatrickd@foxc6.org

Declan FitzPatrick
Exe. Dir.-C&I
636-296-8000 x7178
C: 314-713-2241

From: [Declan FitzPatrick](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: These standards are a massive step back, please don't approve them.
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 6:22:35 PM

Are these standards a step forward from the Current MO Learning Standards?

No

Do these standards provide a focus for assessment of things that are most essential?

No

Do these standards limit and prioritize learning objectives in a way that supports depth and master over surface coverage.

No

--



I've switched to gmail!

fitzpatrickd@foxc6.org

Declan FitzPatrick
Exe. Dir.-C&I
636-296-8000 x7178
C: 314-713-2241

From: [Declan FitzPatrick](#)
To: [1490Comments](#)
Subject: Please reject these standards
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2016 6:40:11 PM

Before we adopt standards, can we have a conversation about what makes for a high quality set of standards and then require that we meet our our expectations?

These standards were developed and design without any expertize in what standards are for or what might make them useful.

--



I've switched to gmail!

fitzpatrickd@foxc6.org

Declan FitzPatrick
Exe. Dir.-C&I
636-296-8000 x7178
C: 314-713-2241